DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 531 EA 021 253

AUTHOR Garland, Virginia
TITLE Cultivating Excellence: A Curriculum for Excellence in School Administration. III. Supervision of the Administrative Staff: The Superintendent's Role.
INSTITUTION New Hampshire School Administrators Association, Durham.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 28p.; For other documents in the series, see EA 021 251-256.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Assessment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Excellence in Education; *Needs Assessment; Occupational Information; *Personnel Evaluation; Personnel Management; School Administration; *Superintendents; Supervision; *Supervisory Methods

ABSTRACT

This report is the third of a series on cultivating excellence in education for the purpose of training and retraining school leaders of the 1990s. The superintendent's role in the supervision of the administrative staff is discussed in four parts. A review of the literature in section 1 addresses several of the difficulties faced by superintendents in assessing an administrator's performance. Concepts such as discriminant function analysis, multidimensional input, instructional leadership behaviors, evaluator bias, managing by wandering around, and merit pay are considered. Controversial issues, including differentiating between elementary and secondary principals, visibility of the superintendent, and teacher input in the evaluation of the principal are also analyzed. Section 2, on needs assessment, provides the superintendent or aspiring superintendents with four questionnaires that can be used to determine the effectiveness of the currently used evaluation and supervision processes within any organizational framework. Suggested criteria for evaluation instruments are indicated in the third section. Finally, a listing of the more significant resources on the supervision of administrators is offered in section 4. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310531

CULTIVATING EXCELLENCE

A Curriculum for Excellence in School Administration

III. Supervision of the Administrative Staff: The Superintendent's Role

By

Dr. Virginia Garland
University of New Hampshire

Prepared by the
New Hampshire School Administrators Association

June, 1989

Morrill Hall, UNH, Durham, NH

EA 021253

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding provided by the Governor's Initiatives for Excellence in Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard Goodman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NEW HAMPSHIRE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS ASSOCIATION

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

SUPERVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE

BY VIRGINIA E. GARLAND, PH.D.

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR

GRADUATE STUDIES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

MAY 15, 1989

SUPERVISION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF: THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ROLE

Virginia E. Garland

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

I. ISSUES IN SUPERVISING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

A. PROJECT GOALS

B. OVERVIEW

C. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

A. RATIONALE

B. "SUPERINTENDENT'S NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY"

C. "SUPERINTENDENT'S NEEDS ASSESSMENT OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS"

D. "ADMINISTRATOR MORALE QUESTIONNAIRE"

E. "ADMINISTRATORS' NEEDS ASSESSMENT OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS"

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

IV. RESOURCES

I. ISSUES IN SUPERVISING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

A. Project Goals:

The goal of this project is to enhance the superintendent's leadership skills in the area of administrative staff supervision. The basic principles of supervision, as well as the newer ideas on management philosophy will be addressed. This module links with other units in the New Hampshire School Administrators Association Leadership Development Project, especially those areas dealing with teacher evaluation and site management.

The demands for accountability in education over the past decade have resulted in an emphasis on performance evaluation for both teachers and administrators. There is ample research on supervision and evaluation of teachers, such as the "Redefining Supervision" theme of the May, 1989 issue of Educational Leadership. Unfortunately, there is scant material available on the supervision of school administrators.

The administrative staff that the superintendent supervises, for the purposes of this project, is considered to be the assistant superintendent, personnel director, special education coordinator, business manager, principals, and assistant principals. However, a major emphasis of this module is on the evaluation of the school principal. Concepts from effective schools literature, management by excellence, and the principal as instructional leader will be applied to the role of the superintendent in supervising and evaluating the principal and other administrators.

Although evaluating the performance of administrators is not an easy task, some recent studies have provided helpful information by focusing on the behaviors associated with instructional leadership. In particular, if the principal is judged to be the most important factor in school effectiveness, it stands to reason that her/his performance evaluation is critical. At the very least, principal evaluations fulfill a contractual requirement in most SAU's, at best, the evaluation is part of a process of supervision which is focused on improving the administrator's performance.

If the principal's evaluation is so vital, then it is also important to determine what areas are to be included in the evaluation form. Each SAU is responsible for its own supervisory process. One can assume that there exists a great diversity of evaluation instruments in districts throughout New Hampshire, representing a wide range of goals and behaviors.

Therefore, one of the goals of this project is for superintendents to examine their presently used evaluation instruments and to compare these tools with the review of the literature on the subject. If deficiencies or inadequacies are perceived in the current forms, then superintendents, with staff input, will be able to incorporate new ideas into their revisions.

I. ISSUES IN SUPERVISING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

B. Overview:

There are some principles regarding the supervision of administrative staff that might be of assistance to the superintendent. However, the effectiveness of the evaluative process in any SAU depends on several factors, including the supervisor's attitudes as well as the nature of the evaluation instruments being used. A basic tenet to follow is that the evaluation process can be used to improve performance.

The distinction between evaluation and supervision is not a theme in this leadership training project. For the purposes of this module, evaluation is viewed as a function of supervision of the school administrator. In the field of teacher supervision, the case is often made for separating the evaluative, or summative reporting, from the supervisory, or formative instruments.

A review of the literature in section one addresses several of the difficulties faced by superintendents in assessing an administrator's performance. Concepts such as discriminant function analysis, multidimensional input, instructional leadership behaviors, evaluator bias, managing by wandering around, and merit pay are discussed. Controversial issues, including differentiating between elementary and secondary principals, visibility of the superintendent, and teacher input in the evaluation of the principal, are also considered.

The value of needs assessments cannot be underestimated, as each School Administrative Unit has a different organizational climate, which in turn has somewhat localized concerns. Within each school district there may be varying ways of supervising and evaluating administrators. Section two, on needs assessments, provides the superintendent with four questionnaires that can be used to determine the effectiveness of the currently used evaluation and supervision process within any one organizational framework.

Suggested criteria for evaluation instruments are indicated in the third section. Superintendents are urged to complete the needs assessments prior to adopting and implementing any set of items.

Finally, a listing of the more significant resources on the supervision of administrators is offered in section five. It is hoped that the New Hampshire school superintendent will find these of use in her/his supervisory practices of the future.

I. ISSUES IN SUPERVISING THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

C. Review of the Literature:

Most of the articles on the supervision of administrators conform to the wave of accountability in education. The inclusion of performance criteria that evaluates a principal's instructional leadership capabilities is considered a key component of most evaluation instruments. The following review of the literature highlights some of the issues and difficulties in the process of evaluating school administrators, with special consideration given to the role of the principal.

What is the **general purpose of the evaluation process** for principals? According to Kienaffel (1984), there are two overall goals: first, **to accurately discriminate between excellent and mediocre principals, and second, to direct each principal to improvement.** If the reason for an assessment is to discriminate between the quality of principals' performances, then it becomes necessary to define a high quality of behaviors. In this comparative measurement technique, the "best" principals are discriminated from the "ineffective" principals. Kienaffel also suggests that an accurate assessment of the quality of a principal's performance must allow for **multidimensional input.** Such input comes not only from the principal herself/himself, but also from supervisors, peers, parents, teachers, and students. This feedback must be on a frequent, ongoing, requested basis. The author concludes that the evaluative process for principals should be preventive, not corrective.

Look and Manatt (1984) discuss the **development of improved criteria** as another critical area in the evaluation of principals. Because the instruments used to gather data should also serve as a diagnostic tool to improve performance, the items on the evaluation tools should be selected with care. The authors suggest that, when the desired behaviors are known, the items in the evaluation can even direct the actions of those being evaluated. For Look and Manatt, content validity is insufficient criteria for the selection of items, which should also be reliable and have discrimination power in order to identify the performance differences between principals.

Yet another difficulty in designing an effective evaluation instrument for administrators concerns the **issue of whether principals are managers or instructional leaders**. The more recent studies have emphasized the importance of the instructional leadership behaviors exhibited by outstanding principals. Eight major research studies on school effectiveness were reviewed by Sweeney (1982), who listed six instructional **leadership behaviors: emphasizing achievement, setting instructional strategies, providing an orderly school climate, evaluating school programs, coordinating instructional programs, and supporting teachers.**

However, educational **management duties** do occupy much of the school administrator's time, perhaps as much as eighty percent. Manasse (1982) helps resolve the debate over the management and instructional leadership functions of the principal by taking the view that this distinction is artificial. According to this researcher, effective principals do not lose sight of their priorities; they make management decisions that promote student learning. The conclusion here is that valid evaluation instruments, especially for the principalship role, should contain both managerial and leadership items.

Another issue, according to Look and Manatt (1984), is selecting areas for an evaluation form that adequately reflect the **differences between the elementary and secondary principalship** roles. They maintain that the physical plant, the faculty and student populations, discipline programs, and extra-curricular activities are all factors of size that should be taken into account. Thus, these two kinds of principals have vastly different quantities of pressures and problems.

Another consideration that arises in the designing of the administrator's evaluation instrument is that of the subjective **bias of the evaluator**. Hogan (1987) believes that prior expectations of evaluators interact with actual performance to offset ratings, implying that evaluators respond negatively to expectations which are not confirmed. Hogan stresses the importance of eliminating evaluation items that may contain bias. This researcher wants the evaluator to be aware that motivational factors, such as cognitive consistency, ego enhancement, commitment, organizational reward and social pressure may contribute to bias.

Similar to Peters and Austin's (1985) concept of **"Managing By Wandering Around"** (MBWA), Murphy, Peterson, and Hallinger (1986) believe that superintendents should actively visit, communicate, and exercise strong instructional management towards each of the principals in their schools. The studies of the latter researchers indicated that the **superintendent's supervision of the principals is lacking in two areas**: one, there is inadequate written information on the supervision process of any one district; and, two, there is a bias in the reliance on intuitive methods of evaluative decisions. Murphy, Peterson, and Hallinger also concluded that, **in effective school districts, the superintendents are highly visible and regularly visited their schools**. They suggest that direct, frequent observations, along with frequent dialogues about district/school operations and goals, add strength to the evaluation process. The evaluative mechanisms should have a blend of formal and informal decisions to determine whether administrators are following school policies, behaving in approved ways, and conforming to the norms and values of the district.

Merit pay is a highly controversial consideration in designing an administrator's evaluation instrument. The report by the National Commission on Excellence in Education has sparked this interest in merit pay, especially for teachers and principals. Kienaffel (1984) states that schools have generally not installed merit pay systems because they cannot reach an agreement on how to adequately measure the educational productivity of their principals. This researcher offers **five conditions that must be in place to make a merit pay system work for administrators:**

1) A sound district-wide decision making process with multidimensional input;
2) A salary schedule that accurately places each administrative position in a justifiable position in relation to each other;
3) An assessment process that defines and discriminates between excellent administrators;
4) A formula to convert ratings into salary increases or decreases; and
5) A review process conscientiously targeted toward improving the whole salary and evaluation system.

What are the **perceptions of principals and superintendents towards commonly used evaluation practices**? Harrison and Peterson (1986) designed a Likert-scaled questionnaire to gather information on the criteria used in the evaluation of principals, the focus and purpose of evaluation, the sources of information used, and the data principals perceive to be important to superintendents. Two hundred principals and one hundred forty-two superintendents responded to the survey. Some of the more pertinent problems in the evaluation of principals, as reported in this study, are:

1) **Dissatisfaction with performance was not as frequently communicated by the superintendents** as the principals would have l liked.
2) Principals believed that they were not evaluated fairly and effectively because of **infrequent visits by the superintendents** (of those sampled, 81% of the superintendents reported frequent visits to the school, while only 37% of principals reported that the superintendents frequently visited their schools!).
3) The evaluation process itself was more consistently perceived by the superintendents, who also generally felt more positive towards it.
4) A higher level of uncertainty than with any other item on the questionnaire was reported when principals and superintendents were asked if superintendents from state to state agreed upon the criteria for principal evaluation.
5) Most of the respondents delineated five major domains of the principal's role, with two to four discriminating performance behaviors under each category.
6) 80% of the superintendents believed that principals know what was expected of them, whereas only **67% of the principals reported being clear as to the criteria on which they were being evaluated.**

7) 43% of the principals believed that supervisors felt management was more important, although **83% of superintendents stated that instructional leadership was more important than management** or public relations.
8) On the average, the principals indicated that they spent their time and energy on activities they believed were important to their superiors and on which they thought they were being evaluated.

Finally, a major study conducted by Buser and Banks (1984) surveyed superintendents, secondary and elementary principals, and teachers to determine attitudes about principal evaluation. The respondents were elected officials of the AASA. NASSP, NAESP and the NEA. According to this research, there was general agreement among the four groups of educators as to the appropriate goals and criteria in evaluating the principal. There was only limited support of the idea that the evaluator's findings should be tailored for the individual being evaluated. Yet, all groups, particularly the **administrators, accepted the concept of "personal-characteristic-referenced" criteria in the evaluation.**

More interesting conclusions from Buser and Banks are in other areas of agreement and disagreement by principals, teachers, and superintendents:

1) The evaluator should be the person's immediate supervisor, there was **no support for the notion of peer evaluation nor that the teacher should evaluate the principal.**
2) The superintendent group was significantly in favor of communicating the evaluation findings to the school board.
3) The respondents agreed that the purpose of evaluation should be improved job performance, better school leadership, and professional growth.
4) As its primary reference, the principal's evaluation should focus on the administrative process and job-specific responsibilities.

There are some questions that can be raised about applying the research results of Buser and Banks to designing the administrator's evaluation instrument. In particular, more **recent trends call for student, parental, and teacher input into the evaluation process of the principal.** There does seem to be some general agreement as to the purpose of evaluation and on the performance areas of an instructional leader. Unfortunately, according to DeRoche (1987), if these performance items are not clearly defined and written, most educators are confused about the evaluation criteria.

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

A. Rationale:

The four needs assessments included in this section are to be used by the superintendent to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the School Administrative Unit's currently used supervision and evaluation process. Two of the surveys have already been field tested in two major urban school districts outside of the state, and two of the questionnaires have been field tested in five New Hampshire SAU's. Superintendents in rural, suburban, and urban districts have found these needs assessments to be effective tools in measuring the organizational climate, staff morale, and attitudes towards the evaluation of school administrators.

Two of the surveys are to be completed by the superintendent alone, and the remaining two questionnaires are to be completed by the entire administrative staff.

The "Superintendent's Needs Assessment Survey" is a Likert-scaled forty-two item questionnaire which focuses on the supervisory techniques employed by the individual superintendent. Questions range from the measurement of creative performance areas to the perceived purposes of the evaluation process.

The "Superintendent's Needs Assessment Open Ended Questions" are a follow-up to the aforementioned survey. Superintendents are encouraged to give their professional views of the evaluation instrument used in their SAU, the data collection methods, and the kinds of administrative staff development they think would be helpful in the area of evaluation.

Administrators other than the superintendent are encouraged to respond to the next two needs assessments. The "Administrator Morale Questionnaire" measures organizational and individual factors influencing administrator morale. Variables affecting school climate and personal attitudes regarding opportunities for growth and professional development are gauged.

Finally, the "Administrators' Needs Assessment Open Ended Questions" consider the administrators' perceptions about the evaluation process. Items range from the accuracy of the rating system to the fairness of evaluating elementary and secondary principals in the same performance areas.

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

B. "Superintendent's Needs Assessment Survey"

Please refer to the survey on the following pages.

SUPERINTENDENT'S NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Please respond to these questions only in terms of the experiences in your current position as superintendent. Circle the appropriate number on the five point scale that most closely represents your attitude.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. I often visit administrators to observe them.	1	2	3	4	5
2. I have conferences with my administrators prior to evaluating them.	1	2	3	4	5
3. I have follow-up discussions to observations of my staff.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Mutual goal setting is part of the evaluation process I use.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I can effectively measure creative performance areas.	1	2	3	4	5
6. The evaluation instrument I use is a satisfactory tool.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I have control over the designated performance areas of the evaluation instrument.	1	2	3	4	5
8. I have control over administrative decisions in my SAU.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I am able to effectively improve unsatisfactory administrators.	1	2	3	4	5
10. I generally rate my administrators as "unsatisfactory."	1	2	3	4	5
11. I generally rate my administrators as "satisfactory."	1	2	3	4	5
12. I generally rate my teachers as "excellent."	1	2	3	4	5

13. I have no difficulty writing diagnosis and prescription.	1	2	3	4
14. I give administrators help in solving problems.	1	2	3	4
15. I often write narrative comments in the evaluation.	1	2	3	4
16. The evaluation process is for professional development.	1	2	3	4
17. The evaluation process is for accountability purposes.	1	2	3	4
18. I spend the same time observing each administrator.	1	2	3	4
19. I use peer coaching concepts in supervising others.	1	2	3	4
20. I am well trained to evaluate my administrators.	1	2	3	4
21. I have enough time to schedule conferences and visits.	1	2	3	4
22. I have enough time for narrative comments on reports.	1	2	3	4
23. I have incompetent staff I am responsible for.	1	2	3	4
24. I write a lot on reports of incompetent staff.	1	2	3	4
25. "Principals helping principals" is realistic.	1	2	3	4
26. My evaluations are fair and consistent.	1	2	3	4
27. Administrators view me as a "helper."	1	2	3	4
28. Administrators view me as an "adversary."	1	2	3	4
29. Administrators know the evaluation criteria.	1	2	3	4

30. The narrative comments I write are subjective.	1	2	3	4
31. I have open communication with my administrators.	1	2	3	4
32. I am prompt in making evaluative comments I find necessary.	1	2	3	4
33. I am well trained in observing administrative performance areas.	1	2	3	4
34. I am committed in time and energy to doing evaluations.	1	2	3	4
35. My most senior staff get more "excellent" ratings.	1	2	3	4
36. My most junior staff get more "unsatis." ratings.	1	2	3	4
37. I have administrators who will not cooperate with me.	1	2	3	4
38. I postpone evaluations until the end of the year.	1	2	3	4
39. My administrators' leadership skills need improving.	1	2	3	4
40. When I prepare the summative report, I spend more than an hour.	1	2	3	4
41. I write up evaluative memos in areas outside the summative report.	1	2	3	4
42. I spend the same time on experienced and inexperienced administrators.	1	2	3	4

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

C. "Superintendent's Needs Assessment Open Ended Questions"

Please refer to the questionnaire on the following page.

SUPERINTENDENT'S NEEDS ASSESSMENT OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

1. How frequent do you think you should be meeting with your administrative staff to discuss performance areas or to observe their leadership skills?

2. What techniques do you use to help your administrators improve? Are there obstacles to helping them?

3. Do you schedule visits to the schools to talk to the principals throughout the academic year?

4. What problems, if any, do you have with the evaluation form you are currently using?

5. How can the evaluation process as a whole be improved?

6. What are the general types of narrative comments you make on the form? Do you tend to write more in relation to certain sections?

7. What do you feel you can do to foster excellence in your administrators?

8. During the evaluation process, what types of data do you collect?

9. What types of workshops, if any, do you think would be helpful in the areas of supervising and evaluating administrators?

10. In what areas, if any, do you believe your administrators are in the greatest need of additional training?

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

D. "Administrator Morale Questionnaire"

Please refer to the questionnaire on the following pages.

ADMINISTRATOR MORALE QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to these questions only in terms of the experiences in your current administrative position. Circle the appropriate number on the five point scale that most closely represents your feelings about your position.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Uncertain	Agree	Strong Agr
1. I have much in common with other administrators in my SAU.	1	2	3	4	
2. There is a lack of supplies and materials for my staff.	1	2	3	4	
3. I keep most of my thoughts on my job to myself.	1	2	3	4	
4. School board members are personally concerned about me.	1	2	3	4	
5. I have increased socializing with other administrators.	1	2	3	4	
6. I consider myself an ambitious person.	1	2	3	4	
7. I worry that administrating is hardening me emotionally.	1	2	3	4	
8. I frequently feel at the end of my rope in my job.	1	2	3	4	
9. I have been active in competitive athletics.	1	2	3	4	
10. The administrators' meetings are excessive.	1	2	3	4	
11. I think a great deal about my problems.	1	2	3	4	
12. The school board policies are fair and consistent.	1	2	3	4	

13. I sleep well on school nights.	1	2	3	4
14. Most people are generally truthful.	1	2	3	4
15. I feel mentally exhausted at the end of the day.	1	2	3	4
16. I understand and accept the goals of my SAU.	1	2	3	4
17. I consider myself to be self-confident.	1	2	3	4
18. I have an optimistic view of others with whom I work.	1	2	3	4
19. Most people outside the SAU respect me.	1	2	3	4
20. I positively influence my staff's lives.	1	2	3	4
21. I resent the faculty I am working with.	1	2	3	4
22. In my spare time I want to be with other people.	1	2	3	4
23. There is a lack of job security.	1	2	3	4
24. I feel physically exhausted at the end of a school day.	1	2	3	4
25. I assist staff outside of the normal working hours.	1	2	3	4
26. I have made many friends in the SAU staff.	1	2	3	4
27. I feel inferior when I say I am a school administrator.	1	2	3	4
28. The world is loving and kind, not cruel and heartless.	1	2	3	4
29. I have a close understanding				

with a partner or friend.	1	2	3	4
30. I often get together with other administrators.	1	2	3	4
31. I am involved in a teamwork activity.	1	2	3	4
32. I have increased use of cigarettes, alcohol, or drugs.	1	2	3	4
33. Some staff blame me for some of their problems.	1	2	3	4
34. I am over-extended with too much work to do.	1	2	3	4
35. I have much in common with the faculty.	1	2	3	4
36. My salary is adequate for the amount of work I do.	1	2	3	4
37. There is extensive student vandalism in the building.	1	2	3	4
38. I am often faced with meaningless, extensive paperwork.	1	2	3	4
39. I feel satisfied with life in general.	1	2	3	4
40. There is lack of adequate time for me to plan my work.	1	2	3	4
41. Students threaten teachers with personal violence.	1	2	3	4
42. I am satisfied with opportunities for personal growth.	1	2	3	4
43. I feel that I resent the individuals I supervise.	1	2	3	4
44. I am spending less time on preparation for projects.	1	2	3	4
45. I share a feeling of comradeship among the adminisrators.	1	2	3	4

46. I experience increased irritability and fatigue.	1	2	3	4
47. With larger staff to supervise, I am more distant.	1	2	3	4
48. There is a lack of parental support.	1	2	3	4
49. Faculty members often come to me for extra assistance.	1	2	3	4
50. More than one person evaluated me during the school year.	1	2	3	4
51. I feel emotionally drained at the end of the day.	1	2	3	4
52. I am given direct feedback on job performance.	1	2	3	4
53. There is good administrator morale in the SAU.	1	2	3	4

II. NEEDS ASSESSMENTS

E. "Administrators' Needs Assessment Open Ended Questions"

Please refer to the questionnaire on the following page.

ADMINISTRATORS' NEEDS ASSESSMENT OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS

1. Who supervises and evaluates you?

2. In which performance areas are you evaluated?

3. When are you evaluated?
   At the end of the school year or throughout the year?

4. How are you evaluated?
   What types of data are collected in order for your supervisor to arrive at a summative report of your performance?

5. Do you think that the rating system used in the evaluation instrument is adequate? If not, please explain.

6. Was your last year's evaluation fair and objective? If not, please explain.

7. How many times did the evaluator visit you at your school or work site?

8. Was the evaluation tool biased in any way? If so, please explain.

9. If you are a principal, were you evaluated as an instructional leader or as an administrative manager? Both?

10. Do you believe that elementary and secondary principals should be evaluated with the same instrument and with the same weight to the performance areas?

11. Are there too many or too few items on the evaluation instrument?

12. If you could change the ways in which you are either supervised or evaluated, what would you change?

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation form should be considered as but one factor in the continuing process of supervision. And, there are some questions worth answering as the criteria for evaluating the administrators are being n developed.

* Is it possible to be both humane and practical when faced with the pressures of educational accountability?

* Surely, a principal has managerial duties, but must s/he also learn to delegate these tasks in order to concentrate on instructional leadership?

* Can merit pay be linked to the ratings on the evaluation instrument?

* Is it fair to give the same weight to elementary and secondary principal performance in all items?

* Does the superintendent have the time and commitment to give in making narrative comments in all areas?

* Will weaknesses become objectives for the next year's evaluation?

* Will administrators being evaluated have the opportunity to input relevant data during the supervisory process?

III. EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Sample categories that could be included in the instrument evaluating administrators:

1. Instructional leadership
2. Administrative management
3. Relationship with teachers
4. Relationship with students
5. Relationship with parents
6. Administrative team role
7. Relationship with community services and business
8. Professional growth and development
9. Communication and interpersonal skills
10. Educational change strategies
11. Problem solving
12. Risk taking
13. Projects to promote excellence in staff and students
14. Financial management skills
15. Facilities design and maintenance
16. Computer skills and implementation
17. Curriculum development
18. Teacher supervision and evaluation
19. Staff development
20. Student activities management
21. Student discipline implementation
22. Innovative projects

B. Sample open ended questions:

1. Have you been instrumental in improving the curriculum and instruction in your school or administrative area during the current school year? Explain.

2. What have been your efforts to improve staff morale?

3. Describe the ways in which you supervise your staff. Do you use a clinical supervision model in addition to the SAU developed evaluation instruments?

4. What has been your role in promoting positive school-community relations?

5. In what manner have student activities in your school encouraged positive self image?

6. Describe your work in management and finance which carry out the goals of the SAU.

7. How have you grown professionally this year?

8. What special projects have you implemented?

9. How have you assisted teachers in improving student academic performance?

IV. RESOURCES

Anderson, R. and Bartlett, C. "Clearing up the Evaluative Process for the High School Principalship." NASSP. 1 (1984): 1-4.

Andrews, H. A. Evaluating for Excellence. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press, 1985.

Brandt, R. "A Changed Professional Culture." Educational Leadership. 46 (1989): 2.

Buser, R. and Banks, F. "The Whys and Whats of Evaluating." Clearing House. 3 (1984): 290-292.

Harrison, W. and Peterson, K. "Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Principals." Urban Review. 2 (1986) 221-235.

Hogan, E. "Effects of Prior Expectations on Performance Ratings " Academy of Management Journal. 2 (1987): 354-367.

Look, E. and Manatt, R. "Evaluating Principals' Performance with Improved Criteria." NASSP. 12 (1984) 76-78.

Keinaffel, B. "Merit Pay for School Administrators Can Work." NASSP. 4 (1984): 87-90.

Manasse, A. L. "Effective Principals: Effective at What?" Principal. 3 (1982): 1-3.

Murphy, J., Hallinger, P. and Peterson, K. "Supervising and Evaluating Principals: Lessons from Effective Districts." Educational Leadership. 42 (1986): 78-82.

Peters, T. and Austin, N. A Passion for Excellence. New York, NY: Random House, 1985.

Peters, T. and Waterman, R. In Search of Excellence. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1982.

Shoemaker, J. and Fraser, H. "What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling." Phi Delta Kappan. 11 (1981): 23-25.

Sweeney, J. "Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership. 2 (1982): 18-20.